## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FORT WORTH DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V.

No. 4:25-CR-076-0

JEREMY MCNUTT (01)

## **FACTUAL RESUME**

- I. <u>Plea</u>: The defendant is pleading guilty to Count One of the information, which charges conspiracy to commit wire fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371 (18 U.S.C. § 1343).
- II. <u>Penalties</u>: The maximum penalties the Court can impose for Count One include:
  - a. imprisonment for a period not to exceed 5 years;
  - b. a fine not to exceed \$250,000, or twice any pecuniary gain to the defendant or loss to the victim(s);
  - c. a term of supervised release not to exceed 3 years, which may be mandatory under the law and will follow any term of imprisonment. If the defendant violates any condition of supervised release, the Court may revoke such release term and require that the defendant serve any or all of such term as an additional period of confinement;
  - d. a mandatory special assessment of \$100;
  - e. restitution to victims or to the community, which may be mandatory under the law, and which Defendant agrees may include restitution arising from all relevant conduct, not limited to that arising from the offense of conviction alone;
  - f. forfeiture; and
  - g. costs of incarceration and supervision.

III. <u>Elements of the Offense:</u> The government must prove the following elements as to Count One of the information:

First: That the defendant and at least one other person made an agreement

to commit the crime of wire fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343,

as charged in the information;

Second: That the defendant knew the unlawful purpose of the agreement and

joined in it willfully, that is, with the intent to further the unlawful

purpose; and

Third: That one of the coconspirators during the existence of the conspiracy

knowingly committed at least one of the overt acts described in the information, in order to accomplish some object or purpose of the

conspiracy.

The elements of wire fraud—the object of the offense—are as follows:

First: That a scheme to defraud existed;

Second: That the scheme to defraud employed false material representations

or pretenses;

<u>Third</u>: That the defendant transmitted or caused to be transmitted by way of

wire communications, in interstate or foreign commerce, any

writing, signal, or sound for the purpose of executing such scheme;

Fourth: That the defendant acted with a specific intent to defraud.

## IV. Stipulated Facts:

From in or about December 2021 through in or about October 2022, in the Fort Worth Division of the Northern District of Texas and elsewhere, defendant **Jeremy McNutt** engaged in a scheme to defraud using a cryptocurrency mining business called Geosyn. **Jeremy McNutt** knew the purpose of this agreement was unlawful and joined in it willfully with the intent to further its unlawful purpose. As part of the scheme, **Jeremy McNutt** and his coconspirators made material misrepresentations to induce individuals and entities to invest money and contribute cryptocurrency mining machines to Geosyn's mining pool.

To accomplish the conspiracy, **Jeremy McNutt** and his coconspirators misrepresented to some of Geosyn's clients that Geosyn had purchased miners on

Jeremy McNutt and his coconspirators used these fraudulently acquired funds to pay off earlier clients and to pay for personal expenses. In order to cover for these fraudulent misrepresentations and omissions, Jeremy McNutt's coconspirators used interstate wires to send out materially false distribution reports that inflated the actual bitcoin mined by Geosyn's pool without telling the clients that their miners were not actually operating.

In furtherance of the conspiracy and to effect its object, in or about September 2022 in the Fort Worth Division of the Northern District of Texas, **Jeremy McNutt** used interstate wires to purchase and send a coconspirator around \$8,000 in bitcoin to cover client distributions. **Jeremy McNutt** knew that the bitcoin did not come from distributions and that all of the clients' machines had not been purchased and/or were not online, but caused the payments to be made to the clients under the false pretense that the payments were distributions, in order to deceive and cheat the clients into continuing to invest with Geosyn.

AGREED AND STIPULATED on this 13 day of March , 2025.

JEREMY MCNUTT

Defendant

MICK MICKELSEN

Counsel for Defendant